







# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			_	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,286	06/21/2002	Karl-Friedrich Muller	HM-480PCT	1111
7	590 07/16/2003			
Friedrich Kueffner			EXAMINER	
342 Madison A New York, NY	venue Suite1921 10173		GOETZ, JOHN S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3725	8
			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	•	10/088,286	MULLER ET AL.	$\bigcirc$				
	Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		John S. Goetz	3725					
	The MAILING DATE of this communicati	on appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addres	:s				
Period fo	• •							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt - Any earn	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion.  s, a reply within the statutory minimum of the y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this commu.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.				
Status	Pagagains to communication(s) filed (	<b></b>						
1)[]	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	☐ This action is non-final.						
2a) [ _	,-		otters prosecution as to the m	erite ie				
3)[	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
•	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w	ithdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
•	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.							
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
-	Claim(s) are subject to restriction ion Papers	and/or election requirement.	·					
, —	The specification is objected to by the Ex							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 June 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.								
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
,—	The oath or declaration is objected to by	tne Examiner.						
-	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		244243413412					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority doc							
	2. Certified copies of the priority doc							
* :	<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).								
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.								
Attachmei	nt(s)							
2) Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper	948) 5) Notice o	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-15					
.S. Patent and	Trademark Office							

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the phrases "can be coupled" in line 3 and "is configured for generating" in lines 4-5. These limitations do not recite apparatus structure nor do they recite a required functional relationship between apparatus elements. Instead, these limitations merely suggest functional possibilities. As such they needlessly confusing and render the claim functionally indefinite.

Additionally, the phrase "of a back-up roll of a roll stand" is confusing because it is not clear as to whether this limitation applies to the bearing unit, the chock the roll pin or the device.

Regarding claim 3, the phrase "like a bayonet closure" is relative and renders the claim indefinite. The phrase "like a bayonet closure" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree of "likeness" and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "in situ, after rotation into an engagement position" in line

5. This limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because: (1) "in situ" means "In the original position" limitation is needlessly confusing because it i

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition copyright © 1992 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Electronic version licensed from INSO Corporation; further reproduction

Application/Control Number: 10/088,286 Page 3

Art Unit: 3725

yet it is followed by the phrase "after rotation" – thus it is not clear what original position is referred to; (2) the phrase is followed by the structural limitation "complementary locking projections" – thus the two phrases suggest together suggest that the structure of the apparatus somehow changes based on its position. The claim is vague and indefinite.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the inner claws" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the free piston end" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5 and 6, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Martins et al. (6,415,489 – hereinafter Martins). Martins discloses a device for mounting and dismounting roller bearings including each of the claimed limitations.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/088,286

Art Unit: 3725

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martins in view of Official Notice.

Official notice is taken of these facts: bayonet-type locking arrangements include extending members with protrusions that work with complimentary tongue and groove elements; bayonet-type locking arrangements are a well-know mechanical expedient for connecting two members or elements together; bayonet-type locking arrangements provide a simple, quick way to connect and disconnect members.

Claims 2-4 add a bayonet-type locking arrangements and its associated well-know structural elements. In light of the noticed facts stated above, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the mounting and dismounting device of Martins with a bayonet-type locking arrangement in order to provide a simple, quick way to connect and disconnect the device.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John S. Goetz whose telephone number is 703-308-1411. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tues, Thurs, Fri 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allen Ostrager can be reached on 703-308-3136. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3579 for regular communications and 703-305-3579 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3725

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-3136.

JSG July 11, 2003

EVAMINER.